

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Brian E. Hancock,	)	Civil Action No. 4:16-427-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
Larry Brown, Chief of Police, and Captain	)	
Bobby Melton,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging several violations of his constitutional rights. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On July 12, 2017, Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, issued a report and recommendation ("Report") outlining Plaintiff's claims and recommending that the Court grant Defendants' pending motion for summary judgment and dismiss this case in its entirety. (ECF No. 99.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. (ECF No. 99-1.) To date, no objections have been filed, and the time for doing so expired on July 31, 2017.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to

which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation to be proper and to evince no clear error, and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s findings.

Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 99) herein by specific reference. Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 91) is GRANTED and this case is dismissed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

August 2, 2017  
Charleston, South Carolina